

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/625,207	07/23/2003	Anthony D. Monk	7784-000600	8374	
27572	7590 11/16/2004		EXAMINER		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			ALSOMIRI, ISAM A		
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIEL	D HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,	•	3662		
			DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004	DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ķ				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/625,207	MONK, ANTHONY D.					
<b>│</b>	Examiner	Art Unit	: .				
	Isam A Alsomiri	3662					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address					
	VIC CET TO EVOIDE AMOUT	LVO) EDOM					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for te, cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communicatio NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23.	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2004.						
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th							
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims			:				
4) Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-11,13-29 and 31-37</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) <u>8,12 and 30</u> is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 March 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Offi	ce Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
		,					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa	any (PTO. 413)					
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-092)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	al Patent Application (PTO-152)					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27, 31-33, 35-36 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meierbachtol US 6,275,182. Re claims 1, 14, 25, 31

and 35-36, Meierbachtol discloses in figures 1-5 reducing depolarization of a wireless signal passing through an antenna radome, comprising: dividing the wireless signal into oppositely polarized signals (+45° and -45°), determining an angle of incidence of the signal relative to the radome 10A, from said determined angle of incidence, determining at least one offset to signal depolarization attributable to the radome, and applying the offset to the signal to reduce depolarization of the signal (see Abstract).

Re claim 2, Meierbachtol teaches the applying is based on at least one pointing angle of the antenna (see Abstract).

Re claim 3, Meierbachtol teaches applying the offset to the signal based on a desired polarization angle of the signal (see col. 3 lines 24-29).

Re claim 4, Meierbachtol teaches storing the at least one offset in a memory; and retrieving the at least one offset from the memory based on at least one pointing angle of the antenna (see col. 2 lines 17-20).

Art Unit: 3662

Page 3

Re claims 5, 20, 27, and 33, it's inherent that wherein applying the offset comprises interpolating among a plurality of offsets (frequency, look angle (phase), polarization, Abstract).

Re claim 6, Meierbachtol teaches determining at least one offset is performed relative to a selected signal frequency (see col. 2 lines 24-29).

Re claims 7, 17, 23, 26, and 32, Meierbachtol teaches wherein determining at least one offset comprises using an angle of signal incidence to determine a radome transmission coefficient (see col. 2 lines 24-29, operating frequency).

Re claim 9, Meierbachtol teaches determining at least one offset comprises determining at least a phase offset (col. 1 line 65 – col. 2 line 20).

Re claims 10 and 16, Meierbachtol teaches applying the offset comprises combining at least phase offset with the signal (see col. 1 line 65 – col. 2 line 20).

Re claim 18, it's inherent the applying is performed periodically during movement of the antenna to compensate for the radome errors.

Re claims 21 and 22, it's inherent that the compensation signal (offset signal) is for compensation on the whole radome which includes the claimed "same side" and "another side".

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3662

. . .

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 4

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Meierbachtol US 6,275,182 in view of Britt.

Re claim 37, Meierbachtol discloses in figures 1-5 reducing depolarization of a wireless signal passing through an antenna radome, comprising: dividing the wireless signal into oppositely polarized signals (+45° and -45°), determining an angle of incidence of the signal relative to the radome 10A, from said determined angle of incidence, determining at least one offset to signal depolarization attributable to the radome, and applying the offset to the signal to reduce depolarization of the signal (see Abstract). It is inherent that the system of Meierbachtol includes an adjustment circuit that applies a variable differential phase shift to the signals in accordance with a desired linear polarization plane orientation angle, to produce similar and the desired phase patterns. However, even if Meierbachtol does not teach the claimed adjustment circuit, having and adjustment circuit according to the claim is well known and it would be obvious to modify Meierbachtol's system to include such adjustment circuit. Britt teaches an adjustment circuit that applies a variable differential phase shift to the signals in accordance with a desired linear polarization plane orientation angle (see Abstract). It would had been obvious to modify Meierbachtol's system to include such adjustment circuit to produce similar or desired phase patterns.

Art Unit: 3662

Page 5

Claims 11, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meierbachtol US 6,275,182.

Re claims 11 and 15, Meierbachtol is silent about determining at least one offset comprises resolving radiated field components of the signal into RHCP and LHCP components. However, the offset signal is based on the polarization, therefore, it would be obvious if not inherent to resolve the signals into RHCP or LHCP component to calculate the offset signal, and because resolving RHCP and LHCP is well known and would be obvious to incorporate such teaching in Meierbachtol's system.

Re claim 13. Meierbachtol is silent about converting between a radio frequency of the signal and an intermediate frequency using one of a downconverter and an upconverter.

However, using a downconverter and upconverter is well known and would be obvious to include one of downconverter or an upconverter to convert between the RF signal and IF signal, for the offset signal.

Claims 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meierbachtol US 6,275,182 in view of Gratt et al. US 5,149,011.

Re claim 19, Meierbachtol is silent about interpolating among a plurality of predetermined amplitude offsets to determine the at least one offset. Gratt teaches using solutions of certain algorithms determine the claimed at least one offset, including interpolating amplitude offsets (see Abstract, col. 3 line 55 – col. 4 line 30). It would have been obvious to compensate for amplitude offsets to compensate for the boresight errors more accurately.

Art Unit: 3662

Re claim 24, Meierbachtol teaches using at least one offset value stored in a memory to

determine a differential amplitude. Gratt teaches determining the boresight error, which includes

determining the differential amplitude (see col. 3 line 55 - col. 4 line 30). It would have been

determine a differential phase (see col. 2 lines 15-20). However, Meierbachtol is silent about

obvious to compensate for amplitude offsets to compensate for the boresight errors more

accurately.

Claims 28 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Meierbachtol US 6,275,182 in view of Rao US 4,499,473. Meierbachtol is silent about having a

phase shifter and an attenuator connected in series. However, having a phase shifter and

attenuator is well known, and having them in series is also well known. Rao teaches a cross

polarization compensating technique for a monopulse dome antenna, using phase shifter and

attenuator in series (see col. 5 lines 33-41). It would have been obvious to use the phase shifters

and attenuator in series to provide the desired phase offset.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Meierbachtol US 6,275,182 in view of Claborn et al. US H173. Meierbachtol is silent about

having a pair of phase shifters and a power divider connected to the phase shifters. Claborn

teaches a power divider 22 connected to phase shifters 20 and 18 (see figure 1). It would have

Art Unit: 3662

been obvious to include the phase shifter and the power divider to compensate for errors by steering phase gradient and feed phase correction to the signal.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8, 12, and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited to (Ivanov et al.; Burns et al; Peregrim et al; DeLano et al.; Hallendorff; Youngren) show various radar systems including compensating for radome errors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isam A Alsomiri whose telephone number is 703-305-5702. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas H Tarcza can be reached on 703-306-4171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3662

Page 8

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isam Alsomiri

November 2, 2004

THOMAS H. TARCZA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Thomas H. Jarry

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**